

REMARKS

ON

Dr. *WARREN*'s

ANSWER

To a Book, Entitled,

A PLAIN ACCOUNT of *the Nature*
and *End* of the *Sacrament* of the
Lord's Supper.

By PHILALETES SUFFOLCIENSIS.



L O N D O N:

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the *Oxford-Arms*
in *Warwick-Lane*. MDCCXXXVI.

Price Sixpence.

REMARKS

ON

DR. WARRER'S

ANSWER

To the Librarian

OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY



LONDON

bl
ful
an
or
by
de
mo
a l
der
pre



REMARKS

ON

Dr. *Warren's* Answer, &c.

HERE are certainly very just and commendable Reasons, why an Author may either Publish or Conceal his Name. The Author of the *Plain Account of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* might probably conceal his, because he thought Truth alone sufficient to maintain itself, by being candidly and fairly represented, without any foreign Help or Support: Or, that his Book might be thereby read over with the less Prejudice, and considered with the more Impartiality; it being common for hot-headed unthinking Men to attack a Book for the sake of its Author, and to condemn a Doctrine purely on account of him that preach'd it.

Dr. *Warren*, no doubt, had his Reasons too; for *publishing* his Name; but be they what they will, had I been the Author of his Pamphlet, I should have had many for *concealing* mine; and especially, that I might not have exposed myself to the just Censure and Contempt of all truly Considerate and Impartial Persons, notwithstanding the high Commendation given by some of his Performance.

Because the Author of the *Plain Account* has *concealed* his Name, therefore the good Doctor looks upon him as a Person *unknown*, and for that reason thinks he may treat him with the greater Familiarity, without any *Ceremony* or *Distinction**; nay, even with virulent Expressions and unjust Reproaches, as he too frequently shews in the progress of his Work; when according to common Sense, and the Rules of Decency and Good-breeding, the less a Person *is known*, the more he ought to be used with Civility and Respect; because 'tis possible, he may be of higher Dignity and more distinguished Merit, than is imagined, and 'tis always best to Err on the safest side.

After this free and undisguised Declaration of his designed Treatment of that Author, he *hum- bly* hopes, “ The Honesty of his Intention, and
“ the Importance of the Subject, will justify his
“ Endeavours; and, that they will be useful,
“ with God’s Blessing, to plain and serious Chri-
“ stians, for preventing their being corrupted in
“ their Sentiments of Christianity †.” That is, when he has given a flagrant Instance of *Pride* and *Ill-manners*, he presently claps on the Mask of *Humility*; and after having confessed a most *un- charitable*

charitable Design, he confidently talks of the *Honesty* of his Intention ; and when he has *discreetly* laid open *the Filth* of his own Heart, pretends by *God's Blessing* to prevent others from being *corrupted*. Heavens! What Sentiments must a Man have of *Christianity*, to think it will countenance such a Conduct as this ; that he can either purge away the Impurity of his Soul, or hide it from the Sight of *God*, whose *Blessing* he expects, by making a Bluster about the Ordinances of Religion ; or. that he can be any way useful to *serious* Christians, when he cannot but disgust them, by beginning in such an offensive and unchristian manner?

In the immediately succeeding Lines, he falsely, and therefore unjustly, insinuates against the *Author*, that he endeavours, “ to lead Men into
 “ mean and unworthy Thoughts of the Nature
 “ and Office of the Lord that bought them, and
 “ of that Pardon and Satisfaction he has wrought
 “ for them ; — and, that the Forms of Prayer
 “ published by the Author at the End of the
 “ *Plain Account*, are not only defective in some
 “ Points, but so affrontive to *God* in others,
 “ so flat, quaint, and affected in the manner of
 “ Expression, so studiously void of Scripture
 “ Phrase and Sentiments, and so foreign to the
 “ chief End and Design of Prayer, as to be utterly
 “ *Unfit* to be used by any Christian whatsoever *.” One would be apt to think by these bold Assertions, that the Doctor had read over and considered these Prayers with the greatest Exactness, or that he believed no one had ever read or consider'd them but himself. But the Case is this : It has been a common Clamour
 against

* Page 2, 3.

against the Author of the *Plain Account*, raised maliciously by some, and carried on ignorantly by others, that he has taken no notice of the Merits and Satisfaction of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*. This Calumny the Pious Doctor is very fond of ; but especially, as it is best fitted to prejudice the Reader in *his* Favour, and to cast an Odium upon the Worthy Person he seeks to depress : For till he has blasted his Reputation, he is very sensible he cannot raise his own ; and therefore chuses this Method, how low and injurious soever, as the most Successful. This then being a material Point, upon which the Character of that Author does *greatly* depend, the way I shall take to rebate the Force of such a pitiful vulgar Artifice, shall be, by producing one Paragraph out of many which might be produced, out of the Prayers of the *Plain Account* ; in which there is not only the greatest Zeal and Fervency of Devotion express'd, but Phrases of Scripture used, and the Satisfaction of *Christ* maintain'd in the fullest Terms imaginable. It is in *Prayer* the III^d, and is this. " I praise thy Holy Name for all that
 " thy Son *Jesus Christ* did, and taught, and *suf-*
 " *fered* in this World, in order to *redeem* Man-
 " kind from the *Power* and *Punishment* of their
 " Sins ; to lead them more effectually to the
 " *Knowledge of thee*, and to the Practice of their
 " Duty ; and to confirm to them the *reasonable*
 " *Hope* of being *immortally Happy* hereafter. For
 " these and all thy Mercies, which respect ano-
 " ther and better Life than the present, my Soul
 " doth magnify thee, O Lord, *and all the Pow-*
 " *ers within me praise his Holy Name* *." Now,
 Does the Scripture say more than this ? Or, Does
 our Church express its Sense in Stronger Terms ?

If

* Psal. ciii. 1.

If not: Let the Doctor for once take Shame to himself, and stand confounded. For this is enough to dash Immodesty itself out of Countenance, to silence all the Misrepresentations which have been made against the Doctrine and Devotion of these Prayers, and to shew that they are (notwithstanding what he has ventured to affirm) *Fit to be used, by any Christian whatsoever.*

To which I shall presume to add, That,
 “ though all the Persons he converses with, do
 “ think they tend to corrupt the Purity of the
 “ Christian Faith * ;” yet all that I have the *Honour* and *Pleasure* to converse with, (which by the bye is *Tit* for *Tat*) are of a contrary Opinion ; and look upon them as the most Rational, the most Pious, and most Scriptural Forms of Prayer, that were ever composed by any private Person. Prayers, in which a Christian’s Duty is most plainly taught, and his Hopes of Salvation most reasonably established, on the constant Practice of pure Morality, and a firm Faith in the Merits of *Christ* ; than which, nothing can be more for the Honour and Glory of God. For Example sake, see again (to this Purpose) a Paragraph in the *Family-Prayer*, which is the *last*, of that Author.
 “ And now, O Lord, confessing and renouncing
 “ all our Sins, and hoping for Pardon of all that
 “ is past, thro’ thy Son *Jesús Christ*, as far only as
 “ we sincerely endeavour to reform and amend
 “ whatsoever we know to be amiss in ourselves ;
 “ we beseech thee, so to concur with us by thy
 “ merciful Providence and good *Spirit*, that, in
 “ the future Conduct of our Lives, we may better answer the Ends of our most Holy Religion, and adorn the Gospel which we profess to
 “ be-

“believe.” Now as this shews, how far the *Author* is in Reality, “from leading Men into
 “mean and unworthy Notions of the *Nature* and
 “*Office* of our Lord, or of that Pardon and Sa-
 “tisfaction which he wrought for us:” So it al-
 so shews, the Truth and Orthodoxy of his Prin-
 ciples both as to Faith and Practice, and is suffi-
 cient to vindicate his Character on that head a-
 gainst all Exception; tho’ (may be) he has not
 said every thing in the Body of his Book, which
 less reasoning and more confused Noddles would
 have cramm’d into it. A very polite Gentleman
 has justly observed, in some *Reflexions* of his late-
 ly published, “That one of the most important
 “Secrets in good Writing is, to say just enough
 “and no more.” This the Author of the *Plain*
Account, I think, has done; and had our *Answer*-
er understood this Secret as well as he, I’m per-
 suaded, he would have lain snug in his Study,
 have thought more, and said nothing.

The next thing the good Doctor falls upon, is,
 the *Author’s* Title-page. “For, whereas he calls
 “his Book, *An Account of the Sacrament of the*
 “*Lord’s Supper*, it is notorious, (*he says*) That
 “the *Author’s* main Intention is to shew, that
 “there is *no Sacrament* at all in it, according to
 “the known Meaning of the Word.*” All that
 I can infer from this is, that ’tis *most notorious* the
 Doctor is self-convinced, that this is *not the main*
Intention of the *Author*; because (as he quotes him
 afterwards, p. 10.) he knows, that he has declared
 in the very first Words of his Book, “That his
 “principal *Design* is, to *instruct* honest and well-
 “disposed Christians in the *right Performance* of
 “that Duty, which is generally call’d, *Receiv-*
 “ing

* Page 1. of the *Plain Account*.

“ *ing of the Sacrament.**” And the *Author* is so far from shewing, or endeavouring to shew, that there is *no Sacrament at all* in it, that in p. 190. of his Book, he asserts, that the Lord’s Supper may be justly called a *Sacrament*, according to the *Definition* of our Church; which I take to be, with us, the only *known Meaning* of the Word: And is, “ An outward and visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace given unto us, ordained by *Christ* himself, as a Means whereby we receive the same, and a Pledge to assure us thereof.” And he there explains, “ Not only how it is an outward and visible *Sign* of an inward and spiritual *Grace*; but also how it is a *Means* of Grace, or *one Mean* among many others, of our Improvement in the Practice of Religion; and moreover asserts, that in consequence of such a Practice, it is a *Pledge* on *Christ’s* Part assuring us of *all the Benefits* of his Body broken and his Blood shed, which are brought to our Remembrance by these *outward Signs*.” What then must we call this? The Doctor’s Misrepresentation, or his Mistake? Or a Mixture of both? The last I believe: For though the *Author* had expressly said, that the Sacrament is *One Mean* of Grace, yet his *Adversary* does not seem to have considered, what is the Sense of *one Mean of Grace*; and therefore misrepresents him, averring without Hesitation, “ That the *Author* maintains, nay, that it is the only Purpose of his Book to shew, that the Lord’s Supper is *no particular Means* of Divine Grace; †” that is, not so much

B

* Page 1. of the *Plain Account*.

† Page 4.

much as *One Mean* in any *one* Sense whatsoever. And at last he is so blinded by Prejudice, and pursues his Argument with so hot a Zeal, that he loses all Thought and Reason, and cries, 'tis plain the *Author's* Notion is, " That " it is attended with *no Grace*, by which God " works invisibly in us.*" By which God works invisibly in us, is a Quotation from the 25th *Article* of our Church; but it only convinces me, that the Doctor knows no more the Sense of the *Church*, than he does of the *Author*: For according to the Definition of a Sacrament, whether in the *Catechism*, or in the *Article*, it is not *Grace* which works invisibly in us, or by which God works, but *Grace is work'd* invisibly in us by the outward and visible *Sign*; or otherwise, the outward *Sign* can be no *Means* of *Grace*. Where then is the Wonder he mistakes his *Author*, when he thus forgets himself? The *Author's* Meaning is not, nor does his Reasoning imply it, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is *no Means*, or no *particular Means*, of *Grace*, (for the contrary he supposes, or affirms, from one End of his Book to the other) but that 'tis no *Means*, by which *Grace is always* absolutely and infallibly worked in us: For then it must operate in us like a *Charm*, or influence us as if we were mere *Clock-work*; without any Regard to the Pre-dispositions or Resolutions of our Hearts. " It does not, " *he says*, work upon Christians, by any necessary or instantaneous Effect; but, as it " leads and helps them to such Thoughts and " Resolutions, as may confirm them in that " universal Obedience, which alone can en-

" title

“ title them to the Promises of *Christ*.*”
 This Account is scriptural and rational ; but
 as for those *extraordinary Influences* and *Impres-*
sions, those *eminent Benefits* and *certain Privi-*
leges, which the Doctor so often speaks of ;†
 as I must confess I do not understand them, so
 I dare say they are what he never felt, nor is
 able to explain.

After the Doctor has thus *logically* puzzled
 and perplexed himself about his *Author's*
 Meaning, and laid the Foundation of all he
 has to say afterwards in Error and Mistake ;
 he very civilly drops his Brat at the Door of
 the *Author*, and would willingly make him
 father it for his own. “ Now, *says he*, this”
 [That which he himself had said] “ is so
 “ *inconsistent* with the Supposition of the
 “ Lord's Supper being a *Sacrament*, that 'tis
 “ *astomishing*, how you (the *Author*) could fix
 “ upon such a Title for your Book. ||” It
 would indeed be *astomishing*, if so fine and
 clear a Reasoner as the *Author* has at all times
 shewn himself to be, should argue so poorly
 and inconsistently, as Doctor *Warren* repre-
 sents him ; but 'tis not at all *astomishing*, that
 a Man who sets out in a Mist of Prejudice,
 and resolves to abuse his *Author* at all Adven-
 tures, should raise Monsters of his own Brain,
 and then have his Hair stand on end at the
 frightful Spectacle. The *Author* has incontest-
 ably shewn, *p.* 190. above-cited, that he a-
 grees with the Church Definition of a *Sacra-*
ment in his Notion of the Lord's Supper :
 But the Doctor very elegantly replies upon
 B 2 him,

* Page 159. of the *Plain Account*.
 43, 52, 71.

|| Page 5.

† Page 5, 21,

him, “ What you have done upon this Occa-
 “ sion is a new and full Proof to me, of what
 “ I have sometimes observed of a Sort of
 “ Men, that there are no Words so plain,
 “ no Decisions so clear and exprefs, but they
 “ can by one subtil Distinction or other,
 “ find Means to evade them.*” To which
 it may be fitly rejoyned: That what the
 Doctor has done upon *this Occasion* is a new
 and full Proof to *me*, that let the *Author* ar-
 gue ever so well, or prove his Point ever so
 plainly; yet there is *a Sort of Men* that will
 stick at nothing to calumniate and defame him.
 The *Author* in *that Place*, not only says,
 “ That according to the Definition of the
 “ Church, the Lord’s Supper is *a Sacrament*,
 “ but that it is an outward and visible *Sign* of
 “ the *greatest* inward and spiritual *Grace*, that
 “ was ever *given to us*; nay, that it is a
 “ *Means* of Grace, and a *Pledge* to assure us
 “ of all the *Benefits of Christ’s Death*: Which
 “ Death, *he adds*, was the highest Assurance
 “ our Lord himself could give us of his Love
 “ to Mankind, and of our own Title to the
 “ Partaking of that Love upon his Condi-
 “ tions. Nothing can be clearer, or more
 strongly expreffed, than this is: Nothing can
 be more scriptural, nor consequently more
 consistent with the Sense and Meaning of our
 Church, which is certainly built upon Scrip-
 ture, than this. But there is *a Sort of Men*,
 which nothing can satisfy: Whose Tempers
 are so peevish, their Judgments so weak, and
 their Eyes so very dim, that they cannot see
 the Light though it shines about them.

For

For notwithstanding all that the *Author* has said so expressly and plainly, yet the Doctor will have it, that his Book is a “flagrant Attempt” to prove the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper to be *no Means* of Grace, nor *any Pledge* to assure us thereof*. One would wonder, what should be the Reason of this tenacious and perverse Opposition: But ’tis truly, because the *Author* is not so great an *Enthusiast* as he, but speaks of Grace as of Something work’d in us after a *reasonable* manner: “As this Religious Rite moves us to “consider the Tenor and Design of our “Holy Religion, and leads our Thoughts “and consequently our Practice, to all that “is Necessary for us to ask of G O D, or to “act ourselves, towards our Advancement “in Piety and Virtue †.” Whereas the Doctor has heated his Imagination with strange and unaccountable Fancies of Divine *Communications* and Extraordinary *Impressions*, received he knows not how, and to Purposes he knows not what; which neither he, nor any of his *sort of Men* were ever the wiser or the better for. However, to give him his due, he thinks he has now caught an Argument that will make his Cause good. For those *Extraordinary Beneficial Influences*, which in *p. 5.* he thinks are convey’d by the *Sacrament*, are what in *p. 7.* he takes to be *those Benefits* which we receive *thereby*; and the *Author’s* Attempt to prove the contrary, he is positive is entirely *cut off* and baffled, by the Explication which our *Catechism* gives of the two Sacraments, *Baptism* and the *Lord’s Supper*:

* Page 8.

† Page 155. *Plain Account.*

Supper : as “ in one ’tis said, the Grace conferred is, a *Death unto Sin* and a *new Birth unto Righteousness* ; and in the other, that the *Body and Blood of Christ* are so verily and indeed taken by the Faithful, that they have their *Souls strengthen’d and refresh’d* thereby, even as their *Bodies are by the Bread and Wine**.” And this he is so sure of, that he leaves the Words without any farther Comment. But why will this doughty Champion provoke me to a Combat, he is *not* prepared for? Have I not already foiled him at the *Article* †, and can he be so presuming as to think himself thoroughly instructed in the *Catechism*, of our Church?

’Tis certain, that the Inward and Spiritual *Grace* signified by the Outward and Visible *Sign* in Baptism, is, a *Death unto Sin*, and a *New Birth unto Righteousness* : This, I say, is *signified* ; but it is not *conferred*, or *actually given*, as the very Learned Doctor dogmatically expresses it. No: the Scripture says, *We are buried with Christ into Death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the Glory of the Father, so we also should walk in Newness of Life* ||. This is our Duty, we should walk in *Newness of Life*, which is the Thing *Signified* in Baptism ; but we receive no *Extraordinary Influence or Impression*, whereby we certainly and infallibly do it. But the meaning is, we are to Endeavour after it, by the Motive of the Obligation we have taken upon ourselves, of being *Christ’s Disciples*, and of living up with the utmost Sincerity

* Page 9.
|| Rom. vi. 4.

† Page 10. of these Remarks.

Sincerity to the Rules and Precepts of the Gospel: And on this Condition, no doubt, we may reasonably expect Divine Favour and Assistance. In like manner, the *Souls* of the Faithful *are Strengthen'd* by partaking of *the Body and Blood of Christ* in the Sacrament: But how? Not by any certain Grace or Virtue, annexed to the material Elements, or convey'd along with them, when given to the *Receiver*, even to the *Worthy Receiver*; (This is a blind, chimerical, superstitious Notion, which wants, and ever will want, Proof and Evidence;) for tho' our Bodies are fed like *mere Machines*, it is wrong Reasoning to say our Souls are fed so too: They must be fed and nourished like *reasonable Beings*, and nothing else: that is, in a rational way, by proper Motives and Considerations, by Persuasives, Reproofs, and such like. And therefore this *Sacrament* becomes the Food of our Souls, when we find our Faith strengthen'd, our Hope increased, our Bowels of Mercies enlarged, and our holy Resolutions confirmed, by seriously and devoutly considering the Nature and End of *this Sacrament*, which is for the more solemn *Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ*, and, of *the Benefits which we receive thereby*; and also, by considering the great Love of God to Mankind in giving his Son *to die for us*, and the Worth of our own Souls which have been purchased at so *Divine a Price*, and the great Danger we must run, if we *neglect our Salvation* by him. These are *Meditations* that arise naturally from the Objects (at that time) before us, and work upon Human Souls in a rational and intelligible

gible manner ; and the Grace or Assistance which God affords thereby, whether *at* or *after* the Sacrament, is so felt, and perceived, and experienced, by the minds of all well-disposed Christians, that none can doubt of it. But as for any thing more than this, 'tis not enough for Doctor *Warren* to affirm, but we call upon him for Demonstration ; and till he brings it, he must give us Leave to say, we think he uses Words without Ideas of Things, and thereby renders his Reasonings heavy, entangled, and incoherent.

Having proceeded so far, and set the *Author's* Doctrine in such a Light as best served his *first Design* of using him without *Ceremony* or *Distinction* ; the Doctor now comes with a supercilious Air, to censure the Method he has taken in explaining Scripture, for the Establishment of his Doctrine. “ You never
 “ fail, *says he*, in your Explanation of any
 “ Texts of Scripture to give *your own* Sense of
 “ the Passage, and then to argue from it as the
 “ true one, how arbitrary soever it may really
 “ be, and however contrary, not only to re-
 “ ceived Opinions, but to the plain Sense and
 “ Purport of the Passage itself. This is cer-
 “ tainly a very *unfair* Method of proceed-
 “ ing, and serves to blind and deceive your
 “ Readers, rather than to instruct them, and
 “ make them Judges of the Point in de-
 “ bate*.” If this be an *unfair Method* of
 proceeding, for a Man to give his *own* Sense
 of what he treats about, then there is not one
 Writer that ever wrote in a serious manner,
 but has endeavour'd to blind and deceive his
 Readers;

Readers ; not even the good Doctor himself, with all his Sincerity and deep Penetration. For let a Man acquire his Knowledge and Sense of Scripture by what Means he will, whether by considering and comparing *Scripture itself*, by reading the *Antient Fathers*, by consulting *Modern Commentators*, or by easily and implicitly espousing *received Opinions*, (which last I take to be the Doctor's own Case) still the Sense he has of Scripture is his *own* ; and if he will venture to propagate what he really thinks and believes, he always argues from it as the *true one*, even tho it should be in the Judgment of others contrary to the *plain Sense* of the Passage itself. If the Doctor cannot see this with his naked Eye, let him put on his Spectacles, and perhaps they may help him to a clearer Judgment. All therefore that he has said upon this Head, is nothing to the purpose ; because 'tis no stronger against the *Author*, than against himself. It concludes *ad hominem*, and cuts his own Throat. To use his own words :
 " I mention this, only to warn him against
 " being too confident of the supposed Merit
 " of his Performance ; and if this be not his
 " own Case, I will take Shame to myself
 " for the Boldness of my Charge against
 " him *."

It seems the Author of the *Plain Account* has laid down in his VIth *Proposition*, " that
 " the Passages in the *New Testament* which
 " relate to this Duty, and they alone, are
 " the original Accounts of the *Nature* and
 " *End* of this Institution of the *Lord's Supper* ;
 C " and

* Page 11, 12.

“ and the *only* authentic Declarations, upon
 “ which we of later Ages can *safely* depend.”
 This Assertion, no doubt, is as true, as that
 all the Rules of a Christian’s Faith and
 Practice are contained in Scripture : But the
 Doctor seeing, there is nothing of *Extraordi-*
nary Influence or *Impression* promised there ;
 but that every thing of that kind is to be
 collected from a warm Imagination, or from
 some Rapturous Expressions of the Holy
Fathers, he answers, No. For, *says he*, “ if
 “ there should be any Difference of Opinion
 “ about the meaning of our Saviour herein,
 “ it must be always safe and commendable
 “ for Men to confirm the Sense they have
 “ of it, by shewing the Agreement it has
 “ with the express and repeated Declarations
 “ of Persons of undoubted Credit and Au-
 “ thority, who came *next after* the Apo-
 “ stles*.” But why, in God’s Name, of
 such as came *next after* the Apostles, and not,
 of the Apostles *themselves* ? Why must we
 leave inspired Writers, for uninspired ? And
 how comes it, that the *Apostles* are not of as
 good Credit and Authority, as those that
 came *after* them ? Is it, because the one make
 for, the other against, him ? And, that he
 dares not trust his Cause in such Impartial
 Hands ? I fear, I have caught my Dear
 Doctor taking *an unfair Method*, which can
 only serve to *blind* and *deceive* his Readers :
 For the *English* of it is, “ You are not to
 mind the Text, but the Comment ; and tho
 you have as much Natural Right, and as
 much Christian Liberty, as any others who
 have gone before you, to examine into the
 Sense

Sense of Scripture ; yet you are to shut your own Eyes, be implicitly obedient to what the *Fathers* have said, and to set those Venerable Old Gentlemen above *Christ* himself ; having more Regard to what they say he meant, than to what he himself has said, and his Apostles after him, in the plainest, most easy, and most intelligible Terms." Excellent Doctrine this, for a *Protestant* Divine ! Methinks his Maxims are too *foreign*, to disguise his Principles. 'Tis true, if the Doctor could carry this Point, there's an End at once of the poor unfortunate Author of the *Plain Account* ; for in *them*, I doubt not, but something may be found like those Extraordinary *Impressions* and *Privileges* he seems so fond of. But supposing, these good *Fathers* should not be all of the same Opinion ; (as 'tis well known, they are not so unanimous in their Sentiments of Religion, and all the Rites of the Church, and every Circumstance of them, as some People talk of) why then, we must see what the next Age says, and so on from one Age to another, till we come to the Year 1736, in which, without controversy, the Church of *England* is the Standard of Truth. But the worst of it is, here again, notwithstanding the express Words of our Church in her *Catechism* and *Articles of Religion*, (which were compiled on purpose, to direct her Members how to think, and keep them quiet) there is a silly vexatious Squabble set on foot by a certain busy-headed *Parson*, against a sly concealed anonymous *Author*, about the true Meaning of her Doctrine, or rather in what Sense it agrees with our Saviour's Institution, of his *Supper*.

And therefore in Spite of all the Doctor has produced upon this Particular, I cannot but recur to the Vth *Proposition* of that *Author*, and join with him in saying, (and I dare say, every unbiaſſed Perſon will do the ſame) “ that ’tis of *ſmall* Importance to Chriſtians, “ to know, what the many Writers upon this “ Subject ſince the time of the *Evangelists* “ and *Apoſtles* have affirmed.” And further, in the IIIrd *Proposition*, “ that therefore “ the *Nature*, the *Deſign*, and due *Manner* of “ partaking of the *Lord’s Supper*, muſt of “ Neceſſity depend upon what *Jeſus Chriſt*, “ who inſtituted it, hath declared about it.” And now expreſſing myſelf as the Doctor does, but to a different purpoſe, “ I believe “ the Reader will, from this plain State of “ the Caſe, think, that the *Difficulties* upon “ this *Queſtion* cannot be certainly deter- “ mined by any other way, than by an “ Appeal” (*not* as he ſays, “ to the *Fathers*,” “ but) to the *Scriptures* themſelves : and ſince the Doctor “ dares not truſt his *Cauſe* upon “ their *Teſtimony* alone,” that, he is conſcious to himſelf, “ they are againſt the “ United Judgment of thoſe wiſeſt and beſt “ Men, which, *he* *boasts*, have written on *this ſide* *.”

The *Answerer* having reaſoned with ſo much Accuracy and Judgment, in his *Vernacular* Idiom ; he riſes upon the Wings of Affurance, and falls down again ſo hard upon the *Author’s Greek*, that there is no bearing the Fury and Force of him. The *Author* had ſaid : “ that ſince the Word [*ἐνχαρις*] which

* Page 22, 23.

“ which *St. Paul* and *St. Luke* use, can signify nothing but giving of thanks to God ;
 “ and the Word [*εὐλογεῖν*] used by *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark*, naturally and easily
 “ signifies the same ; and since both the
 “ Words are applied and designed” (one, of the *Bread*, and the other, of the Cup, even by the two last mentioned Evangelists) “ to
 “ signify one and the same Action of our
 “ Saviour,” (that is, his *Blessing* of both)
 “ it follows, that the Word used by *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark*, must signify *having blessed* GOD, in the sense of giving
 “ Thanks and Praise to him ; and not *having blessed the Bread*, in any other sense but
 “ that of speaking over it Words of Praise
 “ and Thanksgiving to GOD.*” This Argument seems to me so clear and conclusive, that I never expect to see a better upon the Subject : But as it is too low and plain an Account, for the Doctor’s high-flown Expectations of he knows not what ; he beats his Brains for a proper Answer, and instead of a better produces this : “ ’Tis an Injury
 “ done the Translators of the Bible, to suppose, that they understood the Passage in
 “ that Sense, who undoubtedly meant it of a
 “ proper Consecration †.” But, begging his Pardon, this is neither here nor there : For, the Question is not, what the Translators understood, but what our Lord designed. Now, for what our Lord designed by it, I shall quote no Authority but the Doctor’s own, (which at least with himself must have its due Weight) who expressly affirms, “ that
 “ the manner of Expression being the same
 “ here,”

* Page 12. of the *Plain Account*.

† Page 28.

“ *here,*” (in our Lord’s Institution) “ with
 “ that he used when *he gave Thanks* and
 “ *blest* the Barley Loaves and Fishes in the
 “ 9th of *St. Luke*, for the Nourishment of
 “ the Multitude; [*viz. εὐλογήσας, and εὐλό-*
 “ *γυσεν αὐτὸς*] ’tis reasonable to suppose, that
 “ the Form of the Blessing was the same in
 “ both Cases *.” This, I cannot but say,
 is *very* reasonable to suppose: But then I must
 add farther, that he has unawares disarmed
 himself, and given me his own Weapon where-
 with to defeat him. For, when our Lord
blest the Loaves and Fishes, to what End
 was it done? By way of *Consecration*, in an
 absolute and proper Sense? No: But only to
 sanctify them for a common Meal. That is,
 he *blest* and *praised* GOD over them, for
 his Bounty and Goodness to his Creatures;
 and, as the Doctor says, the *Form of Blessing*
 was the same on this Occasion, and, in the
 Institution of the Lord’s Supper, ’tis plain,
 “ he *blest* the Bread in the Lord’s Supper,
 “ in no other sense,” (as the Author of the
Plain Account has shewn) “ but that of speak-
 “ ing over it Words of Praise and Thankf-
 “ giving.” This is the natural Result of
 the Doctor’s own Argument at last, notwith-
 standing his many Pages to twist about and
 perplex the Matter; and if for once he agrees
 with his *Author*, it evidences the Strength of
 Truth, even in the most prejudiced Breast,
 and that sometimes it will break out and
 shew itself to the Confusion of its Adversa-
 ries, in spite of all their Designs and Endeav-
 ours to prevent it.

But

* Page 37.

But let me not omit here, another Remark on the Doctor's Accuracy of Style, in this very courteous Concession of his. He says, "The Manner of Expression being the same" here, as when he blessed the Barley Loaves and Fishes, the Form of Blessing was the same in both Cases." That is, the *Form* of Blessing being *the same*, it was *the same*. Prodigious Discovery! For what is *the Form* of Blessing, but *the Manner of Expression* in that Blessing? But probably he meant, or would be understood to mean, (how confusedly soever he expressed it) that as the *Form* was the same, so the *Effect* also of the Blessing was the same, in *both* Cases; that is, as it was miraculous in the one, so it was also in the other. Which gives an Handle to suppose, he is here paving the Way for the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, or something like it, in the Sacrament; and especially, if the Eulogy be well considered, which he has given to many among the *Ancients* and *Moderns*, whom he calls Persons of *the greatest Name*, "that understand by the *Ἀνάμνησις*;" (which Word we translate *Remembrance*) "a Memorial to God the Father of what his Son hath done for Mankind; and, that his *Passion* is exhibited to God under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, in Testimony of our Faith in the Satisfaction of his Death; and in hopes of *propitiating* God thereby.*" For, whether he perceives it or not, this is highly commending the Notion of a *propitiatory Sacrifice* in the Sacrament; which is not to be conceived, or accounted for, but by supposing *the Body and Blood* of our Lord to be

* Page 58.

be really, actually, and literally offered up to God therein: Which is the *Popish* Doctrine in this Point, and in my Opinion, (who have no great Sagacity for discovering Secrets) looks too much like the Doctor's *own*. But especially, for the following Reasons.

First, he supposes the *Popish* Doctrine of the *Anamnesis* to be true. “ If this (says he) “ *be true*, it does not only destroy your Argument,” (speaking to the Author of the *Plain Account*) “ but gives the *Romanists* an “ Handle to evade the Force of whatever “ you have urged against them.*”. He is certainly in the right: For what *is* true, will infallibly, at one time or other, get the better of that which *is not* so. But methinks it looks a little aukward in a Church-of-*England* Divine, so much as to suppose, (if his Inclination did not tend a little that Way) “ the “ monstrous Doctrine of Transubstantiation, “ and the Sacrifice of *Christ's* natural Body in “ the Lord's Supper,” to be *true*; which the Church he has at present the Honour to be an *External* Member of, has entirely condemn'd and exploded as *false*.

Again, within a Page or two, he takes upon him to justify himself from the Imputation of Popery. “ I am, *says he*, as far from believing the *Popish* Doctrines of Transubstantiation, and of the Sacrifice of *Christ's* natural Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper, as you can be, or any one else.†” Now nothing is a more certain Sign of Guilt, than when a Man unaccused takes upon himself the Vindication of his Character, with respect

* Page 60.

† Page 62.

respect to some particular Crime: And how it could enter the Doctor's Head, to tell the World, he is *no Papist*, but from the Conscience of his own Heart, I cannot imagine. No body had charged him with it: No body had called him *Monk*, or *Jesuit*, or any such thing: And yet he cries, "I'm no *Papist*: I defy you and the D-v-il, for saying so. A-vaunt, ye *Cannibals*! Ye shan't lay hold of me. Stand aloof there, or I'll be the Death of you." Poor Man! He is sensible, he has said something from which this may be inferred; and his Fears distract him. If he talks a little wildly and inconsistently for once; excuse him: It is not his usual Way, I assure you. For generally speaking, he is the most consistent Mortal, that ever set Pen to Paper. In short, "He is so far from bringing so much as one just and *well-weighed* Argument, "that" (to make use of his own very polite and genteel Expression) "All he has hitherto said, is no better than a *continued* String of complete Blunders.*"

Now the Doctor having professed himself so much a Friend to Popery, by having argued for many Pages in favour of a *real* Sacrifice in the Sacrament; and much more, by trying to clear himself from the Imputation, by a *shuffling* Excuse; 'tis no wonder, that his Head is so full of extraordinary *Impressions*, and *Privileges*, and *Benefits* and *Blessings*, partaken of, or received, in that religious Rite. 'Tis upon this Foot, it can be upon no other, that he forms to himself a Reason for expecting them. And hence it is, that he

D

tells

* Page 63.

tells us, “ The Word *κοινωνία*, which signifies *Communion*, when applied to the Body “ and Blood of *Christ*, is usually so applied “ to signify a *Partnership*, as in a common “ Stock of certain [he means, *Popish*] Privileges and Benefits.” The *Romanists* pretend to confer the *Merits* of *Christ*, which are indeed the *Benefits* of his *Death*, in the *Sacrament*; though ’tis absurd to think, that those are, or can be, conferred by any one single Act of Religion, which our Lord has not promised, but to the sincere fulfilling of the whole Law of Righteousness: And with the same Supposition the Doctor undertakes to prove, beyond all Contradiction, that so the Case is indeed, from that Text of St. Paul: *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?** For he says hereupon, “ That the Apostle must mean, that by the “ *Communion of Christ’s Body and Blood* in the “ Lord’s Supper, the Faithful do really” (that is, actually and infallibly) “ receive the “ Benefits of his Passion.†” Not remembering what he himself had said, p. 37. of his *Answer*, which is quite to another Purpose: “ That the Manner of Expression being the “ same, when our Lord *blessed* the Barley “ Loaves, and when he *blessed* the Bread in “ his Supper; it is therefore reasonable to “ suppose, that the *Form*” (perhaps he should have said, the *Nature*) “ of the Blessing was “ the same in both.” That is, as the former was only speaking over the Loaves, Words of Divine Praise and Thanksgiving; so the latter

* 1 Cor. x. 16.

† Page 83.

latter also was only speaking over the Sacramental Bread, Words of divine Praise and Thanksgiving: And 'tis certain the *Apostle* did no more in the *Consecration*, than *Christ* himself did in the *Institution*. This I have from the Doctor's own Mouth; and as it is the only Truth I have been able to extort from him, I think to make the best of it, in order to convince him, that *St. Paul* did not, nor could possibly, mean, either that there was any extraordinary Power or Virtue convey'd to the Elements, in setting them apart by *Blessing* for an holy Use; or, that the Faithful did really receive the *Benefits of Christ's Passion*, in partaking of them. For as the Words, *Body and Blood of Christ*, in the Institution of the Lord's Supper, do certainly only mean, that the *Bread and Wine* were but Symbols or Representations of his Body *broken* and Blood *shed* for us, to bring his Death and Passion to our Minds, and all the Benefits of it, in a more *serious* and *solemn* Manner; so here, in *St. Paul's* Text, the *Communion* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, cannot mean partaking of the *Benefits of Christ's* Death, but only of the *Elements*, which are Representations of it. The Cup is *blessed*, and the Bread is *blessed*; but, in the same Sense, says *Dr. Warren*, as the Barley Loaves and Fishes were, that is, by Words of Praise and Thanksgiving: And say I, Whenever the *Body and Blood of Christ* are mentioned in the Scripture as relating to the Sacrament, it must be in a Sense consistent with that of the Institution; and if *any Man*, even in this Point, *preach another Gospel than*

that which Christ and his Apostles have preached, let him be accursed.

I shall now make but one more Remark, (for to follow the Doctor thro' all his Foibles, would be an endless Business) and that shall be, to shew more plainly (if possible) from another Argument of his, that 'tis *not* partaking of the Lord's Supper, by which, or on which Account, the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are given and received; tho' he brings it, to shew they *are*, on that Account only. 'Tis in the last Paragraph of the *first* Part of his *Answer*; and (for me) let who will read the *second*, supposing it ever comes to a Publication. " They, *says he*, who being *Jews*,
 " did perform the Precepts of their Law,
 " and did also eat of their Peace-offerings,
 " were thereby entitled to the Benefits and
 " Expiations of *their Altar*: In like Manner,
 " all serious and devout Christians, who duly
 " partake of the Lord's Supper, are admitted to a Share in the Expiations and Benefits of *Christ's Death*, commemorated therein.*" Not to take notice here of a common Mistake, *viz.* That we must needs *partake* of what we *commemorate*: Which has been already obviated by the Author of the *Plain Account*, in saying, p.159. " To make
 " this Rite, the *actual partaking* of these Benefits, is altering the Nature of it; as
 " much as *actual partaking* of any thing, is
 " different from remembering it. It is to
 " suppose these Benefits *present*, which we
 " are to commemorate as *absent*, as good
 " Things only promised by *Christ* to all his
 " Fol-

“ Followers who shall be found *at last* to have
 “ come up to his Terms, as far as the Im-
 “ perfections of human Nature would per-
 “ mit.” In which Place, I think the Words,
at last, are very emphatical ; because, what
 the Scriptures teach, or intimate, as *Benefits*
 of *Christ’s* Death, are not any extraordinary
Impressions or *Operations* upon the Souls of
 Men, but the *Pardon of our Sins*, and *everlast-*
ing Life ; which we are sure, neither are nor
 can be *conferred*, till we come into the other
 World. But I say, to take no Notice of this,
 I shall immediately observe, that in this Com-
 parison of the *Jews* Case and the *Christians*,
 the Antithesis of Terms ought to have been
 kept ; and therefore when the Doctor had said,
 the *Jews* were *entitled* to the Benefits of their
 Altar, on such and such Conditions ; he
 should have subjoined (to argue in a true lo-
 gical manner) so *Christians* also are *entitled* to
 the Benefits of *Christ’s* Death, on such and
 such Conditions : But instead of this, he va-
 ries the Terms, and by that Means changes
 the State of his Argument. He says, the
Jews are *entitled*, but the *Christians* are *admit-*
ted ; that is, according to the plain Sense of
 the Words, the *Jews* have a distant Right,
 but the *Christians* an actual Possession. And,
 where now is the Comparison ? Or, if there
 be none, to what Purpose did he pretend to
 make it ? How fatal it is, to trip in the last
 Step, when he fully thought himself on the
 Pinnacle of Glory ! Surely, he must either
 not understand his own Argument, or else
 he endeavours to mislead his Readers. But I
 clear him of all Artifice and Cunning ; be-
 cause

cause he unguardedly concludes against himself, and so much the stronger, as what he says comes from him without any View or Prejudice whatsoever. I shall therefore ask : Does the Doctor in this Quotation say, That all among the *Jews*, who ate of the Peace-offerings were *thereby* entitled to the Benefits and Expiations of *their* Altar? He says no such thing, nor does he mean it : and therefore, none were *entitled* to the Benefits and Expiations of their Altar by eating of their Offerings. But he says, if they *performed the Precepts of their Law*, and *did also eat of the Offerings*, that is, if they did every thing that GOD required of them, *then* they were entitled thereto. On the other hand, does he say, that all who partake of the Lord's Supper, are *thereby* admitted to a Share in the Benefits of *Christ's* Death? No ; he dares not say it : and therefore, none are admitted to a Share, nor even to a just Hope of a Share, in them, purely on that account. But he says, that all *Christians* who are *serious and devout*, (he must mean such, as live up to the Precepts of the Gospel, in Sincerity and Truth ; or such, as truly repent them of their Sins, and humbly ask GOD's Pardon for them thro' *Jesus Christ*, if they have not) supposing *they also partake of the Lord's Supper*, that is, do every thing that GOD requires of them ; *then* they are admitted to a Share in the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, *commemorated* therein. And yet in this he is mistaken : for there is neither true Divinity in what he says, nor indeed so much as good Sense. His Argument will not bear (as I shew'd before) that
they

they are *admitted*; but only *entitled*, thereby, to the Benefits of *Christ's* Death. According to good Sense, they are *entitled* to these Benefits by the Sincerity of an universal Obedience; but according to true Divinity, they are only *admitted* to them, when they have *finished their Course* in well-doing; and perhaps, strictly speaking, not till the day of Judgment, when *GOD shall give to every Man according to his Works*.

F I N I S.



[11]

...and admitted, but only ...
to the ... of ...
... and ...
... by the ... of an ...
...; but according to true Divinity, ...
... only admitted to them, when they have
... in well-doing; and ...
... not till the day of
... when God will give every man
... to his ...

T I M I E



503
71
52
4-
3
573